

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-5 and 11-29 are present in this application.

Claims 1-5 and 11-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action contends that the word “substantive” does not describe a characteristic of user input and does not add weight to the claimed language. As noted previously, however, Applicants submit that those of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate what is meant by use of the term “substantive” in the claims. A Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 is submitted herewith to support this contention. Moreover, Applicants submit that if a term used in a claim “does not add any weight to the claimed language” as asserted in the Office Action, this conclusion alone (whether misplaced or not) does not serve as grounds for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. According to the Examiner’s interpretation, if the term does not add weight to the claimed language, the term can be ignored (e.g., step (c) could be read as “storing user-input data . . .”). In fact, if necessary after reviewing the 132 Declaration, Applicants will consider deleting “substantive” from the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 11-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over an article entitled “Creating Effective Poster Presentations” authored by George R. Hess. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Hess article endeavors to provide assistance in creating an effective scientific poster. Hess describes procedural steps for creating a poster and references software tools (such as Microsoft PowerPoint, etc.) suitable for creating posters. Simple reference to software tools, however, does not address the problems overcome by the method and system of the invention. As referenced in the present specification, poster quality remains highly variable due to the

author's access to appropriate software, the author's software skill level, design skill, printer quality and availability of large format printers for larger posters. See, e.g., paragraph [0010] in the present specification.

In contrast with merely providing helpful guidance and referencing software tools as in the Hess article, the present invention provides a vehicle that facilitates the production of scientific posters over a global network such as the Internet. In its simplest form, the user inputs or selects design parameters for the scientific poster and uploads poster content (i.e., "substantive" data). Subsequently, without requiring expensive software, extensive skill and/or experience in utilizing software, design skills, and/or professional quality printers, the system generates the scientific poster according to the user-selected design parameters and the user-input substantive data.

In this context, although the Hess article indeed provided helpful suggestions for creating a scientific poster, the Hess article does not in any manner even remotely describe a method or system that processes a scientific poster over the Internet or other global network. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least this reason, the rejection is misplaced.

Additionally, although this rejection is premised under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Office Action provides that "[i]t is known in the art before the invention was made template files for scientific poster can be found on the internet by conducting a search in Goggle for 'poster template' and then adding the application name to modified the poster template based on the user interest." Section 102 of Title 35, however, requires that each and every feature of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. Reference to the "Google" search engine to support the rejection is thus renders the grounds of rejection improper. Still further, in this context, the present application claims priority from a provisional patent application as early as

August 22, 2000, and the Office Action does not provide any evidence that conducting a search using the Google search engine for “poster template” at the time of the invention would have yielded such template files. Applicants thus respectfully submit that this rejection is misplaced as improper under §102 and without basis as to the content of material available or accessible via the Google search engine at the time of the invention.

As noted, §102 requires that each and every feature of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. Among other things, claim 1 defines a step of storing user-input substantive data in a dedicated vault and uploading the user-input substantive data. Nowhere does the Hess article describe any system or method where any data is stored in a dedicated vault for uploading data used to build a scientific poster. The Office Action in fact does not reference a single teaching in the Hess article that even remotely meets this feature of the invention. In a related context, however, the Office Action contends that Hess discloses building the scientific poster image (step (d)) “by linking designated files from the user’s dedicated vault and wherein when one or more of the designated files is modified, step (d) comprises updating the scientific poster image according to the modified files.” The Hess article, however, does not reference storage of data nor updating a scientific poster image if a linked designated file in a user’s dedicated vault is modified.

The Examiner provides that this functionality is achieved “by using the existing poster downloading on the website.” Even on the improper grounds of rejection as discussed above, the Google search engine provides only a poster template. Presumably, once the template is downloaded, the user processes the scientific poster using their own design and software skills. The Hess article does not provide even a remote reference to a scenario where if the data from the poster template is modified by the template source, such modifications are updated in the

user's already downloaded template. Since the Hess article does not reference any means for storing poster content, there is no reference to processing of edited poster content. As such, for this reason also, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 is misplaced.

Claims 28 and 29 define related subject matter, and Applicants submit that the rejection of these claims is misplaced for similar reasons.

In discussing the dependent claims, the Office Action evidences a misunderstanding of the subject matter of the present invention. As discussed above, an important feature of the invention is to enable a user to create a scientific poster over a global network, such as the Internet. Downloading a poster template into a local software tool such as PowerPoint or the like is distinguishable from the method and system of the invention. The features of the dependent claims form part of the processing method for processing scientific posters over a global network. Thus, for example, with reference to claim 5, the Office Action provides that Hess discloses the claimed subject matter since "once the template is downloaded from the Internet, such template can be modified based on the user preference, using the software tools to create poster using the existing poster in the Internet." The "existing poster," however, is not created or otherwise processed over the Internet. Rather, the creation of the scientific poster is effected using the local software tools. Thus, although such software tools enable a poster image to be edited, claim 5 defines a step that is performed over a global network as claimed. With regard to claim 11, the Office Action contends that in order to conduct a search using the Google search engine, "one must be granted access to the network." Claim 11, however, references "the Internet web page" defined in step (e) of claim 1 on which the scientific poster image is stored. Claim 11 requires password or ID access to this web page. Claim 12 recites that step (e) is practiced by incorporating hyperlinks into the web page that lead to supplementary information.

Since the Hess article does not in any manner describe a system that effects processing of scientific posters over a global network, nowhere does Hess even remotely describe the use of incorporating hyperlinks into a web page through which access to the scientific poster image is obtained. The Hess article rather merely describes guidelines for creating a scientific poster using existing software, materials, etc.

Independent claim 13 similarly defines a method of processing scientific posters over a global network. Among other things, claim 13 recites that step (a) is practiced by enabling the user to input drill-down components into the scientific poster, wherein step (c) is practiced by uploading drill-down component data from the user, and wherein step (d) is practiced by incorporating the drill-down components into the scientific poster image and enabling access to the drill-down components through the image. The Office Action does not reference a single feature in the Hess article that even remotely discloses or suggests these features of the invention. The Hess article in fact anticipates that only physical (hard copy) posters will be created, referencing materials such as cardboard or foam core, laminated, etc. See Hess at page 5. Hess thus lacks a description of any ability to permit the use of or input of drill-down components within the scientific poster image. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 13 is misplaced.

Claim 14 and independent claim 15 recite that step (a) is practiced by enabling the user to input dynamic components into the scientific poster, wherein step (c) is practiced by uploading dynamic component data from the user, and wherein step (d) is practiced by incorporating the dynamic components into the scientific poster image and enabling access to the dynamic components through the image. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to the

claimed “drill-down components,” Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 14 is also misplaced. Indeed, this subject matter is also overlooked in the Office Action.

With regard to dependent claims 16-20, the Examiner simply repeats the rejection of claim 1 without even a remote reference to the features defined in these dependent claims. As noted, since the Hess article anticipates the creation of a hard copy poster, even using the referenced software products, the features defined in these dependent claims are also lacking.

Independent claim 21 defines a method of processing scientific posters over a global network. Among other things, claim 21 defines a step of archiving scientific posters and cross-referencing related scientific posters, and enabling access to the scientific posters via the global network. In setting forth the grounds of rejection of claim 21, the Office Action merely repeats its rejection of claim 1, which is irrelevant to the claim 21 subject matter. As noted above, the Hess article merely provides guidelines to assist a user in creating a scientific poster. The method defined in claim 21 not only enables processing of a scientific poster over a global network, claim 21 additionally provides for archiving and cross-referencing related posters, which subsequently can be accessed via the global network. The Hess article does not even remotely appreciate this subject matter. Also, these features are overlooked in the Office Action.

The features of dependent claims 22-27 are also overlooked in the Office Action and are similarly lacking in the Hess article.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

As discussed in more detail above, the Office Action either overlooks or misinterprets or misunderstands many of the important features of the present invention. If necessary or desirable, Applicants would be pleased to conduct a personal interview to assist the Examiner in understanding important features of the invention and the distinctions over the references of

BURGEL et al.  
Appl. No. 09/933,868  
June 5, 2006

record. In fairness to Applicants, at least each of the features defined in the claims should be addressed in the Office Action.


On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner provides that "it is important to note that the invention as claimed is old and well known in the computer system environment, where scientific poster templates are generated and stored in the network for use . . . ." As discussed above, however, merely downloading a template for a scientific poster does not in any manner appreciate, disclose or suggest the features of the claimed invention. If an ability to process scientific posters over a global network as claimed is indeed "old and well known in the computer system environment," then Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a sufficient basis to support this conclusion.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:   
Alan M. Kagen  
Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100